

**DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP**

1825 Eye Street NW | Washington, DC 20006-5403  
TEL (202) 420-2200 | FAX (202) 420-2201 | [dicksteinshapiro.com](http://dicksteinshapiro.com)

July 10, 2006

Via Electronic Filing

Honorable Edward M. Chen  
United States Magistrate Judge  
U.S. District Court  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Ricoh v. Aeroflex, et al., Case No. CV-03-4669 MJJ (EMC)  
Synopsys v. Ricoh, Case No. CV-03-2289 MJJ (EMC)

Dear Judge Chen:

We represent Ricoh in the above-captioned matter, and write in response to Mr. Su's letter of July 5, 2006. We believe that the Court's Order of July 5 is clear, and that no clarification is necessary. Defendants have acknowledged that KBSC and Ricoh's counsel have already reviewed the 26 boxes in question. During the meet and confer, the parties had agreed that KBSC and Ricoh's counsel would re-review the 23,000 pages that had been imaged. Although Defendants later changed their minds and sought more, in its July 5 Order, this Court agreed with Ricoh and ordered that "counsel shall re-review the 23,000 pages that were imaged but not produced and then certify that responsive documents have been or will be produced (or identified on a privilege log)." Just as defendants provided no reason why Ricoh's own documents should be reviewed again, they have provided no reason why the KBSC documents already reviewed by counsel should be reviewed again.

Sincerely,



Kenneth W. Brothers  
(202) 420-4128  
[brothersk@dicksteinshapiro.com](mailto:brothersk@dicksteinshapiro.com)

KWB/clh

cc: All Counsel of Record